

## REMARKS

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Claim 12 has been amended. Claims 12-29 are pending in the present application. It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following explanation.

### **II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 12-25 & 27-29 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 12-25 and 27-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,487,421 to Hess et al. (“Hess”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,081,261 to Wolff et al. (“Wolff”) and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,751,741 to Mochinaga et al. (“Mochinaga”). Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

In order for a claim to be rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art must teach or suggest each element of the claim. See Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp., 908 F.2d 931, 934 (Fed. Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 111 S. Ct. 296 (1990); In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 834 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Applicant respectfully submits that this criterion for obviousness has not been satisfied by the Examiner.

Amended claim 12 recites “an **integrated telecommunication terminal in a single integrated housing**” including “a character recognition unit” and “a pressure receiving element,” with “the movement of the pressure receiving element detected by the at least one pressure sensor element being **converted into signaling information by the character recognition unit in the single integrated housing.**” While the Examiner once again contends that Wolff teaches “the movement of the pressure receiving element detected by the at least one pressure sensor element is convertible into signaling information by the character recognition unit (see col. 9, lines 39-57),” Applicant notes that the Examiner is ignoring the limitations of claim 12, i.e., that the “pressure receiving element” and the “character recognition unit” are contained in the single integrated housing. The section of Wolff cited by the Examiner (as well as Fig. 12 referenced in the cited section) clearly indicates that the “optional **auxiliary processor 941** (shown dotted) can be used to augment CPU 940 for

executing **written message recognition algorithms**” and that the optional auxiliary processor 941 is arranged **in the base unit 92**, which is physically distinct from the **pen instrument (PI) 91** which includes the pressure receiving element. Wolff states that “[b]ase unit 92, shown in Fig. 12, communicates with PI 91” and “[t]he base unit is similar to a notebook keyboard computer comprising a CPU 940, keyboard 943, memory 942, and display 95.” (Col. 9, lines 39-44). Accordingly, Wolff does not teach “an **integrated telecommunication terminal in a single integrated housing**” including “a character recognition unit” and “a pressure receiving element,” let alone teach “the movement of the pressure receiving element detected by the at least one pressure sensor element being **converted into signaling information by the character recognition unit in the single integrated housing**,” as recited in claim 12.

In addition to the above, Hess and Mochinaga similarly fail to teach or suggest “an **integrated telecommunication terminal in a single integrated housing**” including “a character recognition unit” and “a pressure receiving element,” let alone teach “the movement of the pressure receiving element detected by the at least one pressure sensor element being **converted into signaling information by the character recognition unit in the single integrated housing**,” as recited in claim 12.

For the reasons discussed above, claim 12 and its dependent claims 13-25 and 27-29 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Hess, Wolff, and Mochinaga. Accordingly, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with respect to claims 12-25 and 27-29 is hereby respectfully requested.

### **III. REJECTION OF CLAIM 26 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hess in view of Wolff and Mochinaga, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,104,388 to Nagai et al. (“Nagai”).

Claim 26 ultimately depends from claim 12. Furthermore, Nagai clearly fails to remedy the deficiencies of Hess, Wolff and Mochinaga as applied against parent claim 12. Therefore, claim 26 is allowable for essentially the same reasons as those presented in connection with claim 12. Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claim 26 is

respectfully requested.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of claims 12-29 are allowable. Since all issues raised by the Examiner have been addressed and obviated, an early and favorable action on the merits is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: 10/1/04

By: *for R. L. Mayer* (by *J. L.*  
Richard L. Mayer  
(Reg. No. 22,490)  
*P. no 36,197*)

One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200

**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**